## Case 3:99-cr-01514-JM Document 65 Filed 07/06/06 Page 1 of 3 USDC SCAN INDEX SHEET

















TKL 7/6/06 15:57

3:99-CR-01514 USA V. HALL

\*65\*

\*CRDODEN.\*

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

		2016 111 - 5 This space for - Clerk's Office File Stamp	
TO: U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE FROM: T. Lewis, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 06/29/06			
	<del></del>		
CASE NO.: 99cr1514-JM DOCUMENT FILED BY: Gordon LeRoy Hill  CASE TITLE: USA v. Hall			
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Notice and Demand to Deliver CUISP Number			
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:			
1	Local Rule	Discrepancy	
×	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation	
$\Box$	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper	
	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely	
<u>×</u>	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document	
$\Box$	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions	
$\bar{\Box}$	7.1	Missing table of contents	
$\overline{\Box}$	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself	
$\overline{\Box}$	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order	
$\overline{\Box}$		Supplemental documents require court order	
$\overline{\Box}$		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest	
		OTHER:	
TI	S HEREBY ORDER	Date forwarded: 06/30/06 ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE ED:	
	The document is to	be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.	
ৰ্		The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.	
	Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate?  Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers		
	Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1  CHAMBERS OF:		
	Dated: 7/3 cc: All Parties  K:\COMMON\FORMS\CIV Form # Civ/Crim 35 (4/98)	CRM35.WPD -{Document Discrepancy / Court Order}	

June 26, 2006



Judge Jeffrey T. Miller
United States District Court Judge
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
880 Front Street
San Diego, California 92101

W. Samuel Hamrick Jr., Clerk of the Court UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 880 Front Street San Diego, California 92101

RE: EX REL PLEADINGS ENCLOSED

## Dear Sirs:

I have sought a statement of accounting on the Miller re-insurance Bond, [274, 275 and 276] SF-24 (Bid Bond), SF-25 (Performance Bond), and SF-25A (Payment Bond), under the Miller Act without controversy and the court has acted in dishonor in failing to comply with my directive of the case/account, Case No. 99 CR 01514.

Enclosed, please find the Ex Rel Pleadings against the parties in this case requiring the Court and the named parties, in esse, to answer or otherwise defend within the three (3) day limit provided, or close the account with full settlement using my personal exemption.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT I SHALL ACCEPT EVERY COURT'S DRAFT FOR VALUE, for the purpose of full settlement and closure of Case No. 99 CR 01514. The Public record of this Court's failure to answer has not been refuted. And superior claim remains unchallenged.

These Motions and accompanying Memorandum are made public with the accompanying Certificate of Service and the Bond is now suspect as a fraud under scienter knowledge in the Case/Account No. 99 CR 01514.

Cordially,

Gordon LeRoy Hall Receiver/Intervener

Lely Hall